

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE *RÈGLES* FOR *HEMEROBIUS*
LINNAEUS, 1758, AND *CHRYSOPA* LEACH, 1815 (CLASS INSECTA,
ORDER NEUROPTERA)

By JOHN COWLEY, M.A.

(Bridgwater, Somerset),

F. J. KILLINGTON, D.Sc.

(Parkstone, Dorset),

D. E. KIMMINS

(Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History).),

and

C. E. LONGFIELD.

(Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History).)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)42.)

In the case of the two following generic names, the strict application of the rules embodied in the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature would cause a very serious, and quite unnecessary, disturbance in existing practice and would, in our view, cause greater confusion than uniformity. For these names we are, therefore, in favour of a partial suspension of the rules. In each case, the object that we have in view can be effected by a very slight departure from the strict application of the Code.

The following is an extract from the paper prepared by Mr. Killington:—

Hemerobius Linnaeus

Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1: 549.

Linnaeus, 1761, *Faun. svec.*: 383.

Latreille, 1810, *Consid. gén. Anim. Crust. Arach. Ins.*: 435.

Leach, 1815, *Brewster's Edinb. Encycl.* 9 (1): 138.

Curtis, 1828, *Brit. Ent.* 4: text to pl. 202.

Westwood, 1838, *Introd. class. Ins.* 2 Syn.: 48.

Rambur, 1842, *Hist. nat. Ins., Névropt.*: 420.

Banks, 1906, *Trans. Amer. ent. Soc.* 32: 29.

Killington, 1931, *Entomologist*, 64: 112.

Type (fixed by Banks) = *Hemerobius humuli* Linnaeus, 1761 (= *Hemerobius humulinus* Linnaeus, 1758).

Latreille (1810) fixed the type of this genus as *Hemerobius perla* Linnaeus, which was one of the original species described by Linnaeus in 1758 and therefore a perfectly valid selection. In 1828, Curtis cited *Hemerobius hirtus* Linnaeus, 1761, as the genotype, but apart from the fact that Latreille had already fixed *Hemerobius perla* as the genotype, Curtis's selection could not stand as *Hemerobius hirtus* was not included among the original species in the Linnaean genus. Westwood, 1838, also cited *Hemerobius hirtus* Linn. The next author to fix a genotype was Banks, who in 1906 selected *Hemerobius humuli* Linnaeus, 1761, which has been shown by Killington (1931) to be a synonym of *Hemerobius humulinus* Linnaeus (the later spelling was probably due to a printer's error). This selection would be valid, were it not for Latreille's action in 1810 in selecting *Hemerobius perla* Linnaeus.

It is unfortunate that for over a century *Hemerobius perla* Linn. has been generally recognised as representing the genus *Chrysopa* Leach (family CHRYSOPIDAE) and *Hemerobius humulinus* the genus *Hemerobius* Linnaeus (family HEMEROBIDAE), for in 1815, apparently unaware of Latreille's action, Leach raised the genus *Chrysopa* for *Hemerobius perla* (and for *Chrysopa reticulata*, although the latter name was not accompanied by a description, and is, in any case, a synonym of *H. perla*), and the two genera *Hemerobius* and *Chrysopa* became the typical genera, respectively, of the families HEMEROBIDAE and CHRYSOPIDAE. With very few exceptions Neuropterists have, since 1815, accepted *Hemerobius perla* as the genotype of *Chrysopa*.

Thus it will be seen that if recognition be accorded to Latreille's fixation of *Hemerobius perla* Linnaeus, as the genotype of *Hemerobius* (i.e. if strict adherence to the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature be enforced), not only will the name *Chrysopa*, so long applied to a section of the green lacewings, have to sink as a synonym to *Hemerobius*, but the family name *HEMEROBIDAE* will have to be transferred from the brown lacewing group to take the place of the name *CHRYSOPIDAE*. Such a change would now be highly undesirable for the following reasons :—

- (1)—the long and universal usage of Leach's division of the two groups;
- (2)—the two families contain together more species than any other two families of Neuroptera;
- (3)—both families are practically world-wide in distribution and the literature dealing with them is far more extensive than in the case of the other families;
- (4)—both families are of great economic importance, and an important change in the nomenclature would result in confusion not only to Neuropterists, but also to economic entomologists;
- (5)—many compound names have been based on the names *Hemerobius* and *Chrysopa*, and, where valid, these would have to remain, with their perpetual and misleading suggestions of non-existent affinities.

For the reasons given above I consider that the strict application to *Hemerobius* Linnaeus of the rules laid down in the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature would produce a state of confusion which the International Zoological Congress intended to avoid when they empowered the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to suspend the rules in cases where their strict application would clearly result in greater confusion than uniformity.²⁰

We are in full agreement both with Dr. Killington's conclusions and with his recommendations, which we summarise as follows :—

(a) THE GENERIC NAME *HEMEROBIUS* LINNAEUS, 1758.

We are of opinion that it would be highly undesirable to disturb the use of the name *Hemerobius* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1 : 549, for *Hemerobius humulinus* Linnaeus, 1758, and its congeners, having regard to the fact :—

- (i) that that name has been applied (with one exception: the genus *Mucropalpus* Rambur, 1842, contained *Hemerobius humulinus* Linnaeus (under the name *M. lutescens* Fabricius)) to species congeneric with *Hemerobius humulinus* since 1758;
- (ii) that the strict application of the rules would transfer the name *Hemerobius* Linnaeus to *Hemerobius perla* Linnaeus, thus displacing the name *Chrysopa* Leach, 1815, which has been almost universally applied to that species for over a century;
- (iii) that the strict application of the rules would transfer the name *HEMEROBIDAE* from the world-wide and numerous group of species now universally grouped under that name to another

²⁰ The above is an extract from the Second Report of the Sub-Committee on Neuropteroid Groups of the Committee on Generic Nomenclature of the Royal Entomological Society of London. At that time the above Committee was composed of:—Sir Guy Marshall, K.C.M.G., F.R.S. (*Chairman*), Dr. K. G. Blair, Dr. F. W. Edwards, Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E., Dr. O. W. Richards, Mr. N. D. Riley, and Professor W. A. F. Balfour-Browne (*Hon. Secretary*). The Sub-Committee's Report was attached to the Fourth Report of the Committee on Generic Nomenclature, which, on 24th February 1937, was submitted by the Committee to the Council of the Royal Entomological Society of London, with a recommendation that this case should be forwarded to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for favourable consideration. The Committee's recommendation was approved by the Council of the Society and, on the publication, on 30th June 1937, of the Committee's Fourth Report, the recommendation regarding this case was forwarded to the International Commission by the Council of the Society.

world-wide and numerous group of species known universally as the CHRYSOPIDAE.

The fixation of *Hemerobius humulinus* Linnaeus, by Banks (1906, *Trans. Amer. ent. Soc.* 32 : 29) as the type of *Hemerobius* would be valid but for the fact :—

- (i) that Latreille (1810, *Consid. gén. Anim. Crust. Arach. Ins.* : 435) cited *Hemerobius perla* Linn. as the type; and
- (ii) that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature had expressed the view in *Opinion* 11 that Latreille's "table des genres avec l'indication de l'espèce qui leur sert de type" "should be accepted as designation of types of the genera in question".

We are of opinion that it is highly desirable that in the exercise of the plenary power conferred upon them by the International Zoological Congress, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should as soon as possible take the steps laid down by the Congress for the promulgation of an *Opinion* to the following effect :—

Opinion 11 of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature regarding the designation of genotypes by Latreille, 1810, shall not be interpreted to mean that in the work referred to in that *Opinion* Latreille designated *Hemerobius perla* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type of the genus *Hemerobius* Linnaeus. Consequently the fixation by Banks in 1906 of *Hemerobius humulinus* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type of that genus is valid, and the name *Hemerobius* Linnaeus as thus defined is hereby added to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*.

(b) THE GENERIC NAME *CHRYSOPA* LEACH, 1815.

We are of opinion that it would be highly undesirable to disturb the use of the name *Chrysopa* Leach, 1815, for *Hemerobius perla* Linnaeus, 1758, Brewster's *Edinb. Encycl.* 9 (1) : 138, and its congeners, having regard to the fact :—

- (i) that that name has been almost universally applied to those species since its establishment by Leach in 1815;
- (ii) that the strict application of the rules would involve not only the transfer of the name *Hemerobius* Linnaeus, 1758, to the species almost universally placed under *Chrysopa* since the establishment of the latter genus by Leach in 1815, but would also involve the transfer of the name *HEMEROBIIDAE* from the world-wide and numerous group of species now universally grouped under that name to the world-wide and numerous group of species known universally as the CHRYSOPIDAE.

Hemerobius perla Linnaeus, 1758, the only valid species cited by Leach, 1815, in his original description of the genus *Chrysopa*, could be recognised as the genotype of *Chrysopa* but for the fact :—

- (i) that Latreille (1810, *Consid. gén. Anim. Crust. Arach. Ins.* : 435) cited *Hemerobius perla* Linnaeus as the type of *Hemerobius* Linnaeus, 1758, and that if this fixation be accepted *Chrysopa* becomes a synonym of *Hemerobius*; and
- (ii) that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature had expressed the view in *Opinion* 11 that Latreille's "table

des genres avec l'indication de l'espèce qui leur sert de type ”
“should be accepted as designation of types of the genera in question ”.

We are of opinion that it is highly desirable that in the exercise of the plenary power conferred upon them by the International Zoological Congress, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should as soon as possible take the steps laid down by the Congress for the promulgation of an *Opinion* to the following effect :—

The name *Chrysopa* Leach, 1815 (type *Hemerobius perla* Linnaeus, 1758) is hereby added to the *Official List of Generic Names*. The name *Hemerobius* Linnaeus, 1758, is, therefore, not to be substituted for *Chrysopa* Leach, 1815, on the ground that it has priority over that name, though it is available for *Hemerobius humulinus* Linnaeus, 1758.

**ON THE QUESTION WHETHER *ACARUS ALATUS* HERMANN, 1804, IS
INVALIDATED BY *ACARUS ALATUS* SCHRANK, 1803, AN UNRECOG-
NISABLE SPECIES (CLASS ARACHNIDA, ORDER ACARINA)**

By the late ARTHUR P. JACOT.

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)131.)

Acarus alatus Schrank, 1803, *Fauna boic.* 3 : 214, is an unrecognisable species, *i.e.* potentially a *nomen nudum*. *Acarus alatus* Hermann, 1804, *Mem. apt.* : 92 pl. 4 fig. 6, is a recognisable species. Is the latter a usable name or a homonym? That is to say, does a trivial name applied to an unrecognisable species or a *nomen nudum* make the same trivial name invalid for subsequent use, if published in combination with the same generic name?